THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BUILDING CODE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 2004

+ + + + +

The above-entitled Meeting convened in Room 220 South, 441 4^{th} Street N.W., Washington, DC 20001, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m., Marc Fetterman, Chairman, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARC FETTERMAN, Chairman, AIA/DC BYRON BLACK, WBC COLLIN BURRELL, DOH LESTER CLEMONS, NTA HOWARD EBENSTEIN, DCEO HOWARD GIBBS, PEPCO MILES HABER, M-NCBIA ARMANDO LOURENCO, AFAA JAMES LOWERY, IUEC SAMANTHA McASKILL, ASID GAIL MONTPLAISIR, AU SHAUN PHARR, AOBA JIM SHABELSKI, DCWASA NANCY SKINKLE, DCCHC JOHN STOVALL, M-NCBIA SCOTT VANDAME, AFAA JOHN WALL, DC/CSI

ALSO PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Office of Zoning

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I-N-D-E-X

| Accessibility Subcommittee Report | 15 |
|--|----|
| Electrical Subcommittee Report | 16 |
| Elevator Subcommittee Report | 17 |
| Fire and Life Safety Subcommittee Report | 21 |
| Plumbing Subcommittee Report | 24 |
| Issues and Policies Subcommittee Report | 25 |
| Residential Subcommittee Report | 28 |
| Structural Subcommittee Report | 29 |

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2

1

10:22 a.m.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Good morning, everyone. MR. FETTERMAN: For the record, my name is Mark Fetterman. I'm the Building Code Acting Vice Chair of the Advisory Committee, and we are having our regular monthly meeting today, June 16th. There is an agenda that's been handed out, and attached to the agenda proposed bylaws. Does anyone have anything they would add to the agenda before we start going We can certainly also address items at through it? the end of the agenda.

Seeing none, let's go through it in this order, if that's okay with everyone. But I do want to add to the beginning a bit of sad news and some wonderful news. The sad news, as many of you know, Jerrily Kress' husband passed away a couple of weeks they had had long and wonderful ago, and а relationship. And Jerrily is taking some time off to adjust to all this and has committed to several of us her desire to get back into work as soon as she can.

A second item of good news is that Sara

Bardin, who is helping us as Jerrily's assistant for so long on this subcommittee, had her baby daughter, Jacqueline, and they're doing great. And, in fact, it was wonderful. At Jerrily's husband's service, Sara brought her new daughter to the service.

With that, Sharon Schellin, who is hiding behind the column here and has been helping us so much while Sara has been out, has been in touch with the boards and commissions regarding our reappointment as BCAC members. And we are told that it is still going to happen, and that's about all the news we have under Item A, "Reappointment of BCAC Members."

So it's a bit of a complication for me, but what I was trying to wait for this morning were nine people, which our bylaws ask that we have at a meeting to have a regularly-scheduled meeting. But because the many new dedicated members, several of whom are here today, as you've been at each of our meetings, are not yet sworn in, and I've got to count the nine from the group of old-timers. So we are at that point, and I apologize for waiting 20 minutes to start.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Yes, Howard? I'm not a Roberts Rules of Order person to know, but I would defer to others.

Item B status is very simple. These are items that Denzil Noble's office has responsibility for proceeding with, and, with the absence of anyone from BLRA today, I will write a letter to Denzil and ask him to update us on these items.

I do want to thank publicly the people from the elevator group for writing a letter to Jerrily asking about the last item under B, the last bullet, the July 31st, 2004 deadline to complete elevator retrofits. When that letter was forwarded to me, due to Jerrily's bereavement, I wrote a letter to Denzil and attached your subcommittee's letter and asked for a response. I've heard nothing.

I also did a little investigation, as your group probably had already done, and went to the BLRA web site, which has a ?- excuse me while I fumble for a second. It has a page, it has a lead page for the Building and Land Regulation Administration, as many of you may know. And underneath this lead page is special announcements as one of the seven bullets that

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

you can click on, and the only item in the special announcement is a letter from Denzil to Jim Upshaw about the, saying that the July 31st elevator retrofit is still active. So I, again, very much appreciate your group bringing this to our attention, and I will probably, since the e-mail hasn't elicited a response, actually write another letter for that.

Did you have something to add? I pulled that off the web site this morning.

MR. LOURENCO: Armando Lourenco. That letter is the one that was posted when the July 2004 deadline was established. It's my understanding it's stale, I guess, outdated. And it's my understanding that we have already made a decision to at least postpone that to some later date in 2005. They haven't come out with a specific date or text amending that because they are debating whether that's the way they want to go, or if they want to just scrap the whole thing.

MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you, Armando. Your information may be later than mine. The last I heard from Denzil at our last BCAC meeting, Jim, was that

the lawyers at DCRA had decided that, because the supplement had been repealed, that the requirements did not exist. But he wasn't willing to state that as a 100-percent fact, it's just a 90-percent feeling. And we've been waiting now for a month to understand hear where that issue is heading. And if we something, we will certainly announce it this to group.

Item number C is each subcommittee's review of the 2003 code amendment for typos and other small corrections that we felt, as a group, should be done before the building code is republished. I'm very happy to report the fact that Fire and Life Safety has looked at this again and has a little, one or two small things to add to it, which can happen instantaneously. And the great news is that Armando Lourenco and his office have made the time to go through Chapter One of the Building Code and sent to me, as I mentioned in a surprise to several of you, at 2:00 this morning, the proposed revisions. going to Sara Bardin in Jerrily's office for compiling it in a document, and we will get that over

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | to Denzil's office as quickly as we can. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Armando, did your review include reviewing |
| 3 | the Chapter One of the Fire Code, or do we need to |
| 4 | look at that? I don't mean to add |
| 5 | MR. LOURENCO: Judging from the 90-some |
| 6 | items I found on the other chapter, we probably |
| 7 | should. |
| 8 | MR. FETTERMAN: Yes. I was disappointed |
| 9 | to find ten in construction and to see that you came |
| LO | up with 90, many of which, many of your revisions |
| .1 | helped to clarify and bring it back to what we had |
| .2 | passed. |
| L3 | MR. LOURENCO: One of the reasons why I |
| _4 | found 90 was because that chapter was thoroughly |
| .5 | worked over by Corporation Counsel, as usual, because |
| L6 | it has administrative issues. It's not surprising. |
| .7 | MR. FETTERMAN: Well, again, Armando, |
| -8 | thank you very much for finishing the building code |
| .9 | work. Did anyone have anything to add to that item? |
| 20 | Item D. I offered this as a suggestion to |
| 21 | the committee. It comes from a couple of people on |
| 22 | the Fire and Life Safety Subcommittee that met at its |

first regular meeting last week, and the suggestion is that would it be helpful to have a seminar or presentation to enable the opposing issues regarding the desirability of sprinkling single-family dwellings be a subject of one of these meetings, perhaps our September meeting.

As many of you recall, we heard a very thoughtful presentation earlier at a regular meeting that John Stovall helped to arrange by a person who industry works in the housing and was And I know there are some in this group sprinklers. that have very strong feelings both ways. And our feeling was that it might, that it would make a lot of sense to either bring that person back and certainly supplement it with a person or persons who could speak thoroughly to the other side of the issue.

And we did not get a chance to discuss this at our Executive Committee meeting, and so I thought I would bring it to the whole group and see if there was a feeling one way or the other.

MR. LOURENCO: Armando Lourenco. Being one of those that has strong feelings about this, I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

think it's probably appropriate for Byron to establish a working group, as provided for in the bylaws, to go over this in as a dispassionate way as we can because I think this is a very serious matter that has very specific underlying data that's available that can be brought up to the attention of the committee. I think it would be better to do it that way because it would not take as much time of the full committee as having that discussion going over on the full committee. that way conclusions, obviously, opinions from both summarized sides could be and brought the I think that would be a better way of committee. using the time of the committee.

MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you. Can you pass the microphone behind you? Howard raised his hand next.

EBENSTEIN: Howard Ebenstein, MR. DC. Energy Office. I'm thinking that it would be the full committee appropriate because presentation from, I quess, the anti-sprinkler side, as it were. And I think maybe Armando's suggestion is a good one. Both things could go on, but I think it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would just provide, you know, some balance to the full committee. And then if Byron does create the working group, we can hear what they have to say. But I just think it will provide a little more balance at this time. I don't really -? I quess one question I have, is this committee going to be expected to vote on this issue in the future, the full Building Code Advisory Committee?

MR. FETTERMAN: We have been asked by Denzil to consider a number of emergency amendments, which were discussed at our last meeting, our last And Denzil had committed to full committee meeting. get us the list of those, as well as the text of the amendments, to each of us, and that has not When I asked Denzil that question, happened. answer is he very much wants our input. John Stovall asked whether, this was so politically charged, was our input going to be helpful or -? help me here. is this a political hot potato, or is this something that we can, by spending our volunteer time on it, contribute to city policy? And Denzil's strong feeling was that they want our input.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. EBENSTEIN: Right. Well, I sense that it's also, you know, to some extent, a political issue. And I'm just feeling down the road that it would be appropriate, it would be right to be able to say that the full committee got presentations from both sides, if nothing else just to cover the bases here.

MR. FETTERMAN: And I think our ?- thank you. And I think our hope was to make sure that Denzil and those in our office, his superiors that are feeling the heat on this, no pun intended, are able to come, as well as people from the city council, who have strong feelings, one or another. We, you know, very much want to open this up and bring in people who have very strong feelings on both sides of the issue and make sure that the decision makers for the city have the opportunity to be at this presentation.

MR. EBENSTEIN: Well, my only thought about that is that they didn't have an opportunity to sit in on the previous presentation, so it might not be balanced if they only hear, you know, the second side of the issue. I think we need to be careful to

| 2 | on that. |
|----|---|
| 3 | MR. FETTERMAN: I think that's a great |
| 4 | point, and I think what Byron was intending was to |
| 5 | treat both sides equally at the meeting. So for some |
| 6 | of us who had heard the earlier presentation, there |
| 7 | would be some repeat. But perhaps the presentations |
| 8 | could be made a little more succinct and meaty, so |
| 9 | this did not become, you know, a four-hour event. But |
| 10 | I leave it up to Byron and the others that feel |
| 11 | strongly about this to gather the right people |
| 12 | together and to tell us how long it takes to |
| 13 | effectively present both sides. |
| 14 | MR. EBENSTEIN: So at this presentation |
| 15 | you're envisioning, where there would be council |
| 16 | members and other people, would both sides of the |
| 17 | issue be presented, or would just the remaining side |
| 18 | be presented? |
| 19 | MR. FETTERMAN: Both sides. |
| 20 | MR. EBENSTEIN: Okay, all right. I didn't |
| 21 | understand. |
| 22 | MR. FETTERMAN: It's probably me. |

treat both sides equally here. So that's my thought

MR. EBENSTEIN: Okay, thank you.

MR. BLACK: Byron Black. I guess I would disagree with Armando on this one. I think that this summer, probably up through September, since probably unlikely we're going to get the 2003 codes before then, that this may give us a rare opportunity where we would have the time to get a full committee that's pretty well organized together to hear some of this because it does cross a lot of subcommittee lines, and I think most, not most but probably a great number of the subcommittees are affected by this to some degree. Our intention was to have probably a repeat of that previous presentation, which was antisprinkler, to try to get somebody who was representative of sprinklers. Another one is perhaps getting fire marshals from Prince George's County or Montgomery County to see what their experience has been and to try to gather as much statistical data we can as to this kind of fires or how many deaths would have been caused by not having the sprinklers or just is there any numerical data that you can lend weight to to make a decision on it.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | MR. FETTERMAN: And I think we also talked |
|----|--|
| 2 | about what I thought was a wonderful idea, and you've |
| 3 | said it, and I'll elaborate a little. In querying the |
| 4 | other, you know, large northeastern cities to see how |
| 5 | this issue is being handled in similar-sized and |
| 6 | larger-sized cities. |
| 7 | MR. BLACK: Right. And I think what I |
| 8 | would also recommend is we try to make this meeting as |
| 9 | open as possible, to invite as many people from the |
| 10 | city and other interested parties, because I think it |
| 11 | is the result of the working session. There's going |
| 12 | to be a lot of people that are very knowledgeable. As |
| 13 | soon as that working committee reaches a decision, |
| 14 | they're going to say, "Well, what about this?" or, |
| 15 | "What about that?" and it's going to open the whole |
| 16 | thing up. So I think if we can get everybody that's |
| 17 | concerned together all at one time and then try to use |
| 18 | that as a basis for reaching a consensus. |
| 19 | MR. FETTERMAN: Howard behind you has |
| 20 | another comment. |
| 21 | MR. EBENSTEIN: Yes. I think another |

interested party would be the insurance industry.

That certainly affects the long-term, you know, costs and could reduce insurance rates. I don't know. But maybe this should be more like a panel, a special, it doesn't have to be a special session of the Building Code Advisory Committee. It could be on a regularly-scheduled time, but it would be a different format, and perhaps we can have a panel here. We've got room for five panelists up in the front there, and folks can just present their views on it and limit them to, you know, whatever, 15 minutes a piece or something.

MR. FETTERMAN: And that would be one of the calmer issues that usually happens. Byron, could I ask, it sounds like the general feeling is very positive, and if I could ask you to continue with the lead on this and working with people who have other strong feelings, like Armando, to put this together.

MR. BLACK: I'd be glad to.

MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you. The last item under administrative matters, attached to your agenda are proposed bylaws, and what we have done is to take the 1996 bylaws, which we are currently working under, and to show, either by underlining or cross-throughs,

proposed changes or deletions. And I ask you to look at those over the next month for questions at our July meeting and voting at our July meeting. Obviously, if anyone has any questions today, we'd be happy to entertain them, but this is very much in the spirit in which we have been accepting changes to the building code. We introduce them at one meeting, and then they are discussed and voted on at a subsequent meeting.

Would anyone like to make any comments about these now? My recommendation would be let's make this a subject of our July meeting. Thank you.

Subcommittee reports. Samantha for Accessibility. I know you people have been meeting. Thank you very much.

MS. MCASKILL: Samantha McAskill, the We met June 4th. Accessibility Subcommittee. absence of code books, we did have other things that we discussed. The consideration of automatic door, and we talked by phone with an industry representative cost, about how much they the difficulty retrofitting in existing the buildings, the ease of use, maintenance, those kinds of things. And based on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that information, the subcommittee is going to continue investigating the possibility of requiring a certain number of automatic or power door-openers in very specific types of facilities using ANSI and ADAG requirements as the guidelines, as far as the type of equipment to be considered acceptable.

The other thing is that the ANSI is on the street. It's been published, the 2003 ANSI, so we are considering using the 2003 ANSI as part of the new code cycle instead of the '98 ANSI, which is currently referenced in the 2003 IDC. But we are holding off on considering that until the new ADAG is published, which we understand will happen in July. So we are going to do a review both of the new ADAG and new ANSI at the same time to see if it would be appropriate for us to consider using the 2003 ANSI.

And that really is the bulk of the other things that we considered to date, in the absence of code books.

MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you, Samantha.

Construction Subcommittee is me, and I have no report.

We have not met. Electrical is next. It's Frank

Becker. I have spoken with Frank a couple times this week, and he is unable to be with us today. But as you see under the bullet in Item number C, on the second page, BCAC did receive a one-line electrical diagram in April. And thanks to the work of several people, including Scott Vandame and Armando, some concerns about it were pointed out, and it appears to be an item that Frank was asked to review again to decide whether he wishes this to be an emergency amendment. But it's been clarified that it is not one of the typos or correction amendments that we are presently trying to get to BLRA.

Jim, do you have anything to report for elevators?

MR. LOWERY: Good morning. I'm Jim Lowery, co-chairman of the Elevator Subcommittee. The subcommittee met on June 2nd at 10:00 a.m., and it was attended by ten members to accept Don Rosenberger and Dick Shaffer's report on the most important items that should be addressed at the District of Columbia in the A-17.3 codes. It was decided that the subcommittee would go back and get information ready for the next

BCAC committee meeting.

The subcommittee decided that an e-mail would be sent to Jerrily Kress requesting that the omitted portion of the A-17.3 from the register be put back on the agenda at the next BCAC meeting held on the 14th of July. The subcommittee voted that a letter be sent to Denzil Noble would be re-sent to Jerrily Kress, John Drand, and Sidney Lester.

The next meeting will be held July 7^{th} at 10:00 a.m. at the IUEC Local 10 union hall. Thank you.

MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you, Jim. I have a copy of the letter that, with regard to the applicability of the July date for elevator recall, but I did not get a copy of the other one. And I know that Sharon has been trying to send to me the e-mails while Jerrily is out. Can you re-send that to her, please? Because we don't have that letter asking about that the 17.3 be restored.

MR. LOWERY: Okay. We'll make sure that gets sent over here then.

MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you. And our next

NEAL R. GROSS

BCAC meeting is the 21^{st} of July, I think. It's the third Wednesday.

MR. LOWERY: Very good. We'll make sure we're at the right one.

MR. LOURENCO: Ι have two questions. First, the question on, I heard you say that you were considering A-17.3, which, to my knowledge, is not in the list of codes of standards for adoption either in the 2003 or 2005. Ι don't understand why the subcommittee is dealing with a standard or a code that's not in the list of codes to be adopted. That decision needs to come from the Executive Committee. I still don't understand why you keep on doing work on something that the Executive Committee didn't direct you to go in that direction.

MR. LOWERY: Well, actually, we were, early on, asked to look into it, and the problem is with this A-17.3, as some of you may or may not know, what it deals with is restrictive devices and things like that that, and you guys probably heard about lately a person was just killed recently on an elevator trying to get out of an elevator that she was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

instead of waiting for somebody, trapped in, elevator mechanic to come get her out. That wouldn't have happened if A-17.3 was in vote. It's because it does not have a restrictive device, which means that any person in an elevator can open that door up. simple, not very expensive, and it saves lives. Ιt was in the DCR-12 up until recently, where it Now the only time that you can have that done to an elevator is if you're doing renovations to it, and that's why we're looking into it, and we're just going to give the recommendation the committee.

MR. FETTERMAN: Yes. Jim and Armando, I believe at our last meeting we asked the elevator work on existing elevators to be coordinated with Joan Stogis, Existing Structures Committee, and that we were trying to get her to take, Existing Structures to take the lead on all these items. So I want to make sure that these recommendations go to her group, and I know she is out of town at the moment, too, and I know there's also some concerns with regard to Fire and Life Safety because we very much want to do what is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 2 | coordinated effort. |
|----|---|
| 3 | MR. LOWERY: Yes, exactly. Joan, nor |
| 4 | myself, was at the last subcommittee meeting, I must |
| 5 | say. I wasn't at that meeting either. I was just |
| 6 | reading off the minutes of what they had met. Just |
| 7 | for the record, that's the first one I've missed. |
| 8 | MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you. Did you have |
| 9 | another question, Armando? Don't go away. |
| 10 | MR. LOURENCO: Thanks. I understand your |
| 11 | point. I just want to make sure that the committee |
| 12 | works the way it's supposed to and won't run off on a |
| 13 | tangent, grabbing other codes and confusing the |
| 14 | picture, which leads me to my next question to |
| 15 | Samantha. Are we going to have the opportunity to |
| 16 | discuss that in the Executive Committee before going |
| 17 | into the 2003 ANSI 17.1 and before going into the |
| 18 | 2003? The Executive Committee is going to look at |
| 19 | that before you embark on that? |
| 20 | MS. MCASKILL: Well, we're going to look |
| 21 | at it again before we embark on it so we have more ?- |
| 22 | MR. LOURENCO: Obviously, we need your |

right for the city, and we want to do it as a

| 1 | input at the Executive Committee. Okay. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you. Thank you |
| 3 | both. Energy? |
| 4 | MR. EBENSTEIN: Energy has not met for the |
| 5 | 2003 package, and we don't expect to meet until we get |
| 6 | the code books. And also, for the record, my |
| 7 | intention is, from what I know about these codes, is |
| 8 | to have the 2003 energy codes adopted without |
| 9 | amendment. |
| 10 | MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you. Joan, as the |
| 11 | chair of Existing Structures, is out of town. Is |
| 12 | there anyone from that subcommittee that can report? |
| 13 | Okay. And I know that Collin is working with Joan. |
| 14 | Fire and Life Safety is next, Byron. |
| 15 | MR. BLACK: Byron Black, Fire and Life |
| 16 | Safety. We held our regular meeting last Thursday, |
| 17 | and we might add that on this list in the future. |
| 18 | It's the Thursday before the full committee meeting at |
| 19 | 1025 Connecticut Avenue. |
| 20 | A number of things were discussed at the |
| 21 | meeting. We mentioned earlier the part about the |
| 22 | sprinklers, which occupied a good part of the meeting. |

One other thing was the corrections. There were two items that had been brought up that needed additional corrections, and I sent a list to Sharon the other day. And just talking to Armando this morning, that fire control requirement, I'm going to be sending you something later today, Sharon, that will be an additional correction to fire command room, and that should be the end of corrections, I would hope.

The second item that was discussed, and Mark mentioned a few minutes ago that there may be a package of things that are attempted to be put through as an emergency addition to the code, and this might This is something that came up in IBC be one of them. that has two paragraphs that, when they're both read they contradict each other, and the end together, result is an office building design could be affected quite drastically from what it's been over, as long as I can remember, where, basically, two stairs, one goes directly to the outside, and the other one discharges This interpretation, which we through the lobby. first got caught on it in Montgomery County, would mean that you could not do that. This was something

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that our people in the office on code review missed it. Montgomery County missed it. And then when they got down to when they were reviewing plans for one of the tenants going into the building, somebody came up with this. And so far, nobody's ever been able to say that his interpretation is wrong. So it's something that we're hoping that would be corrected at the national level over the period of the next couple of years.

But in the meantime, it would seem to me there's two possibilities that we could try to make the correction in the District. One is to get through an emergency package that would contain the correction to this. The other one would be to have the Building Department make an administrative interpretation that would produce the same result.

So I think what I want to do is to get our subcommittee to get together and come up with a draft to be part of this potential package of emergency items to be covered. I believe that covers all of the things that we discussed at Fire and Life Safety.

MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you. Mechanical,

NEAL R. GROSS

George Papadopolous. This is another bit of good news. He continues to recover well from his horrible automobile accident that he had last December and has been seen in the office on a cane, which is amazing news because he has been in a wheelchair up until about three weeks ago. So we're hoping that his health continues to improve and he is able to be part of our regular group.

Mike Herdeman e-mailed me, and he is out of town and has nothing to report. Plumbing and Mr. Shabelski is next. Whose got the microphone? Armando does, or Jim. Oh, I'm sorry. We did that on purpose. I'm sorry.

MR. SHABELSKI: How's that? Okay. Well, believe it or not, the Plumbing Committee has met twice, once in May and once in June. We meet the first Thursday of the month at 941 North Capital Street on the second floor. We have five members. We meet at 10:00 on that first Thursday, and anyone who wants to join could send me an e-mail. We discussed numerous issues. I do have the plumbing code because I went ahead and bought everything, and we've been

| 1 | looking at some of the changes that are in there. |
|----|--|
| 2 | But in any case, Byron brought up an issue |
| 3 | about plumbing fixtures for office buildings, and |
| 4 | somehow that didn't get on and get approved during the |
| 5 | last cycle. But what I found is that it is already in |
| 6 | the 2003 code, so, if we don't rush it, it's going to |
| 7 | be there if we go ahead and approve that. It looks |
| 8 | like they have all the building requirements that were |
| 9 | in the Virginia code that's in there. |
| 10 | And DC WASA is, we have a consultant or |
| 11 | board looking at lead issues, particularly evaluating |
| 12 | the California code and the no-lead concept. That's |
| 13 | all I have to report. |
| 14 | MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you very much. |
| 15 | Armando on Issues and Policies. Again, my apologies |
| 16 | for skipping over this. |
| 17 | MR. LOURENCO: That's okay. Did you get |
| 18 | property maintenance? |
| 19 | MR. FETTERMAN: I did. |
| 20 | MR. LOURENCO: Issues and Policies. Yes, |
| 21 | we met also in May and June. We meet right here or |
| 22 | the first Wednesday of each month, 10:00. At the last |

meeting, we ended up dealing only with one item, the interesting subject of the bylaws that you have with you now for discussion in July, which pretty much what you have in front of you is what came out of the subcommittee, after being picked apart by Howard at the last Executive Committee meeting.

We don't have anything else to report. We hope to be able to start going through some of the administrative things for the new code at this next meeting in July, and we hope someone will attend. At the last meeting, there were, yes, David Bardin, Mark Fetterman, Shaun Pharr, myself, and Jerrily Kress as the chair of the committee attended it, so we hope to have the same amount of people at least.

MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you. May I ask one other question as an acting vice chair prerogative? put a bullet under your group because I noticed, in reviewing another project, that continued in we Chapter One of the building code that 1869 Board of Aldermans three-inch high letters. But in Byron's fire code, said that lettering we on buildings more than 25 feet away from the street has

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| to be at least four inches. And this was one of the |
|--|
| items that I had reported as part of my review of the |
| Construction Subcommittee, but I hadn't gotten any |
| feedback on that, and beg the full committee's |
| indulgence, but would like to get your feeling on how |
| we should deal with that issue. |
| MR. LOURENCO: I believe the act of the |
| Board of Alderman is a law. |
| MR. FETTERMAN: And that was how I had ?- |
| MR. LOURENCO: The second thing is I don't |
| think it's restricted to three inches. It says it's |
| got to be at least three inches. |
| MR. FETTERMAN: Right. |
| MR. LOURENCO: So if there's another |
| portion of the code that says, "Well, in certain |
| conditions, you've got to go four inches," or whatever |
| it is |
| MR. FETTERMAN: But that's only in |
| existing ?- |
| MR. LOURENCO: I don't think they |
| conflict. |
| MR FETTERMAN Okav |

| 1 | MR. LOURENCO: They compliment themselves. |
|----|--|
| 2 | I will have to go back and look at the actual ?- |
| 3 | MR. FETTERMAN: Well, I'd like to go over |
| 4 | that with you. It seems to me it's unfortunate if a |
| 5 | new building owner has to have at least three-inch |
| 6 | high letters, but if I have an existing building, I'm, |
| 7 | you know, required to have four-inch high letters. |
| 8 | MR. BLACK: Byron Black. My recollection, |
| 9 | when we covered this, and we were not taking into |
| 10 | account the Alderman of 1869 or whatever, but BOCA |
| 11 | requires four-inch letters. We felt that in |
| 12 | residential areas, that's excessive for a building |
| 13 | that's very close to the curb line, so our intention |
| 14 | was that basic rule is four-inch high lettering. |
| 15 | However, if the building face is less than 25 feet |
| 16 | from the curb line, then three-inch lettering would be |
| 17 | permissible. |
| 18 | MR. FETTERMAN: Right. It's just that it |
| 19 | conflicts with this DC law. |
| 20 | MR. LOURENCO: I'm not sure it conflicts. |
| 21 | I think if you put four inches, it meets the act, if |
| 22 | you put three inches it meets the act. And they |

both, based on the 25 feet distance, meet the code. So I don't think it has a conflict. It's a discrepancy in the number, but I think the way the requirements are set up, it works without changing.

MR. FETTERMAN: Okay. Well, I don't, I'll discuss it with you later. I wouldn't want to take the committee's time further. Thank you for your patience. Residential?

MR. STOVALL: John Stovall, Residential. We met second Tuesday of this month. We organized our efforts for dealing with new amendments. We plan to meet on July 6th, would be our next regular meeting, and devote that meeting to beginning the amendments for the 2003 IBC. I'm going to be on vacation at our next meeting, so I'll entrust everything to this able committee. Unfortunately, Miles will not be present then either. If we have any issues which we need to discuss, we'll bring them to Mark's attention before the meeting. And we are open to the public. Thank you.

MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you. Howard, Structural. He's right behind you, John.

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | MR. GIBBS: Morning. Structural |
|----|--|
| 2 | Subcommittee has not yet met, primarily due to lack of |
| 3 | codes. But I don't anticipate a real long effort in |
| 4 | getting our stuff together. We have very few |
| 5 | amendments, and it will pretty much relate to things |
| 6 | that are longstanding in the code and haven't been ?- |
| 7 | the code part hasn't changed, so I expect that the |
| 8 | need for our amendments will still be there, and we |
| 9 | should be able to wrap that up fairly quickly once we |
| 10 | get the votes. |
| 11 | MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you very much. That |
| 12 | concludes our subcommittee reports. Any other items |
| 13 | that anyone would like to bring before the committee? |
| 14 | Seeing none, our next meeting is July 21 st at 10:00 in |
| 15 | this room. And, traditionally, we do not meet in |
| 16 | August. So thank you very much. |
| 17 | (Whereupon, the foregoing matter was |
| 18 | concluded at 11:06 a.m.) |
| 19 | |
| | |